THE

RESEARCH BULLETIN (Arts)

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF THE PANJAB

Previous Numbers

I.	*Charu Deva, Shastri,* M.A., M.O.L.	ON THE FUNCTION AND USE OF THE PREPOSITION IN SANSKRIT (*in English*) *Price*, Rs. 1/2/-
II.	*S. C. Chakravorty,* M.A.	'SENTIMENT' AND 'SENSIBILITY': THEIR USE AND SIGNIFICANCE IN ENGLISH LITERATURE (*in English*) *Price*, Rs. 1/12/-
III.	*Jai Deva Sethi,* M.A.	SOME CONTROVERSIAL ASPECTS OF NATIONAL INCOME (*in English*) *Price*, Rs. 1/12/-
IV.	*Anup Chand Kapur,* M.A., Ph.D.	DISRAELI'S FORWARD POLICY ON THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER OF INDIA, 1874-77 (*in English*) *Price*, Rs. 1/14/-
V.	*Indar Nath Madan,* M.A., Ph. D.	PREM CHAND: A Social Analysis (*in English*) *Price*, Rs. 1/10/-
VI.	Do	Do (*in Hindi*) *Price*, Rs. 2/-/-
VII.	*Kartar Singh Duggal,* M.A.	SOME TENDENCIES OF NEW PANJABI LITERATURE (*in Panjabi*) *Price*, Rs. 2/6/-
VIII.	*Miss A. G. Stock,* B.A.	THE AGE OF NIGHTMARE (*in English*) *Price*, Rs. 1/7/-
IX.	*Vishva Bandhu, Shastri,* M.A., M.O.L.	THE TṚCA (RV. 1, 41, 7-9) RE-INTERPRETED (*in English*) *Price*, Rs. 1/14/-
X.	*Satya Pal Jagota,* M.A.	A SURVEY OF THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION (*in English*) *Price*, Rs. 2/10/-
XI.	*Miss A. G. Stock,* B.A.	TAMBURLAINE AND THE SUPERMAN (*in English*) *Price*, Rs. 1/7/-

Copies can be had of :

THE

RESEARCH BULLETIN (Arts)

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF THE PANJAB

1954

No. XIII (iv) **VEDIC LITERATURE** **Pp. 1—15**



THE GĀYATRĪ (RV. III, 62, 10)

by

VISHVA BANDHU,

Shastri, M.A., M.O.L. (Pb.), O.d'A (Fr.), Kt. C.T. (It.),

Honorary Director,

VISHVESHVARANAND VEDIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE, HOSHIARPUR.

General Editor :

DIWAN CHAND Sharma, M.A., M.P.,

Head of the Department of English,

UNIVERSITY OF THE PANJAB, HOSHIARPUR.

Price Rs. 1/12/-

Published for the University of the Panjab by Vishva Bandhu from the Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute and printed by Deva Datta Shastri at the V. V. R. Institute Press

The Gāyatrī (RV. III, 62,10):

Its Grammatical Problem[1]

By

VISHVA BANDHU, HOSHIARPUR.

Summary

1. The neuter pronominal form *tát* in Pāda *a* being syntactically correlated to the alleged masculine pronominal form *yó* in Pāda *c* sets out a construction which is obviously invalid in grammar.
2. Commentators have generally tried to tide over this difficulty either (a) by taking the accusative pronominal form *tát* as standing for the genitive pronominal form *tásya* towards its concord with the genitive nominal form *savitúḥ* or (b) by construing the alleged masculine pronominal form *yó* as standing for the neuter pronominal form *yát* towards being concorded with the said neuter pronominal form *tát* governing *bhárgaḥ* in Pāda *b*.
3. The former of the above alternative proposals towards grammatical concord cannot be accepted for the following reasons :—
   (*a*) It spoils the poetic charm and directness of appeal.
   (*b*) It is metrically inadmissible.
4. The latter alternative proposal, too, cannot be accepted, for the Vedic idiom does not at all countenance concord of this type between pronominal forms of different genders.
5. A few commentators have also made quite a mess of the whole thing by taking *bhárgaḥ* in Pāda *b*, which is accusative singular of the neuter base *bhárgas-*, as nominative singular of the

1. Having been presented to and read at the XVII Session of the All India Oriental Conference held at Ahmedabad in October, 1953, this paper is being published here, with due permission, in a retouched and revised form.

In this paper, the abbreviations of the Vedic text-names agree with those employed by Bloomfield in his ***Vedic Concordance*** and the accent-marks in text-citations in the Devanāgarī script follow the present writer's method employed in his ***Vedic Word-Concordance***, under which the accent proper is marked by a horizontal under-stroke, if *Udātta*, or, by a vertical up-stroke, if *Svarita*.

masculine base *bhárga-* towards its concord with the alleged masculine pronominal form *yó* in Pāda *c*.

6. The solution proper, under the current Pāṇinian terminology, lies in construing yó in Pāda *c* as the neuter nominative singular of any one of the pronominal bases **yás-*, **yáv-*, and **yávan*, being postulated as variants of *yád-*. Compare, in support of these postulates RV. I, 84, 9 and I, 155, 4 where the adverbial neuter singular (**yás->*) *yāḥ*, and RV. I, 116, 6; 144, 4; 148, 1; 3; 151, 1 and VI, 34, 3 where the adverbial singular neuter (**yám-* [=**yáv-*]>) *yám* (=**yáv*>**yó*) are used alike in place of the familiar form (*yád->*) *yāt* (*d*). Also, compare, for a study of parallel declensional variants the pronominal base *tád-*, RV. I, 144, 5, VIII, 13, 19 and VIII, 45, 33.

7. The following few other points of linguistic interest have also been touched incidentally:—

 (*a*) Postulation, in special contexts, of (*i*) √**bhakṣ* 'beg', (*ii*) √**vṛ* (in *váreṇya-*) 'shine', (*iii*) √**su(ū)* (in *prasavá-*) 'purify', (*iv*) √**cud* (in *pracodáyāt*) 'purify'. and (*v*) √**dhā*, *dhī*, (in *dhīmahi* and *dhī-* in the Gāyatrī) 'worship'.

 (*b*) Demonstration of lack of justification for the Pāṇinian dictum (compare III, 1, 85 and the *Kārikā* सुप्तिङ् etc.) that the Vedic idiom admits of mutual confusion of genders and declensions.

 (*c*) Metrically, *tát* in the Gāyatrī cannot do service for *tásya*, as proposed by some, towards its concord with *savitúḥ*.

* * *

I

The well-known ṛk, remembered among the followers of the Vedic religion, as *Sāvitrī*, being in praise of the god Savitár, as Gāyatrī, being composed in the metre of that name or as *Gurumantra*, being the Vedic text which an *ācārya* makes his new *brahmacārin* first learn by heart at the time of the *Upanayana* ceremony of the latter, occurs, among the Saṁhitā texts, in RV. (III, 62, 10), SV. (II, 812), VS. (III, 35; XXII, 9; XXX, 2; XXXVI, 3), TS. (1, 5, 6, 4; 8, 4; IV, 1, 11, 1) and MS. (IV, 10, 3) and, also, in the later ritualistic texts at numerous places. It reads as under:—

तत् सवितुर् वरेण्यं, भर्गो देवस्य धीमहि। धियो यो नः प्रचोदयात् ॥

II

The relative pronominal form *yó* in Pāda *c*, constituting the dependent clause, has natural syntactical connection with the abstract noun *bhárgas-*, occurring in its accusative singular form in the first hemistich, which constitutes the principal clause. *Bhárgas-* as employed here is a neuter base. This is indicated not only by its own declensional pattern but also by the neuter accusative form *tát* of the demonstrative pronoun *tád-*. That this demonstrative pronoun *tát* could be construed with the word *bhárgaḥ* only and no other word in the principal clause, though quite evident, should become further clear from the recognition of the psychological necessity of taking the demonstrative pronoun as understood if it is not found expressly employed in a similarly constituted complex sentence. Thus, to take one out of the numerous examples of this type of usage, a reference might be made here to RV. VII, 96, 6, where in the same Gāyatrī measure and in striking resemblance to the text before us, the diety proper is sought to be praised and approached, indirectly, through the praise of and the approach to something else, appertaining to the former. That text reads as under:

पीपिवांसं सरस्वतः, स्तनं यो विश्वदर्शतः। भक्षीमहि प्रजामिषम् ॥

Here the poet Vasiṣṭha would address his request (√**bhakṣ* '*beg')[2] for 'progeny' (*prajā́-*) and 'prosperity' (*íṣ-*), to the god Sárasvat-, not directly but indirectly through the medium of the said

2. This radical postulate is to be distinguished from √*bhakṣ* 'eat' and, also, it is not to be taken as being related to √*bhaj* 'enjoy' (as Sāyaṇa and, after him, other commentators have done). On the other hand, it might be said to have extended, morphologically as well as semasеologically, from √**bhas'* (=*vas'*) 'long for', the latter itself having been a similar extension from √*bhṛ(=*vṛ*) 'choose', 'desire' OIA. √*iṣ*, √*icch*, √*bhikṣ*, √*vas'* and √*ven*, Panjābī √*labh*, √*lor* and √*mañg*, Hindī √*māṅg* and English √*beg*, √*want*, and √*wish*. all signifying 'desire' or 'need', might just be suggested as a few other radicals, traceable to a common ultimate proto- IE. origin. That √*bhakṣ*, in the present context, possesses the postulated meaning is not only contextually appropriate but is also grammatically sound as is borne out by the word *stána-*. 'breast' as denoting the source of *prajā́-* 'progeny' and *iṣ-* 'prosperity', which are the real objects in view, being governed by the verb *bhakṣīmáhi*, along with the said two objects, in the accusative case in accordance with the OIA. idiom referred to by Pāṇini : *akathitañca* (I, 4, 51) and, also, indicated in the well known traditional list of roots (*duh-yac* etc.) which, along with their other synonymous roots, govern this type of secondary object along with the primary one.

god's 'breast' (*stána-*) which is accordingly praised by him as being 'full' (*pīpivás-*) and as having made 'all observable by it' (*viśvā-darśata-*).

In Pāda *b*, the demonstrative pronominal accusative singular 'that' (*tám*), being the logical demonstrative pronominal accusative singular correlative of the expressly stated relative pronominal nominative singular *yó*, is to be taken as understood (Compare Sāyaṇa's relevant comment: *yo viśva-darśataḥ ... tam stanam*).

III

The neuter pronominal form *tát* in Pāda *a* of our text along with the neuter nominal form *bhárgaḥ* in Pāda *b* being syntactically correlated, as shown above, to the pronominal form *yó* in Pāda *c*, which all previous commentators have taken as masculine, sets out a construction which is obviously invalid in grammar. While ancient Brāhmaṇic commentaries have taken no notice at all of of this important grammatical problem[3], later Indian commentaries have duly noted it and tried to solve it either (a) by taking the accusative pronominal form *tát* as standing for the genitive pronominal form *tásya* towards improvising its concord with the genitive nominal form *savitúḥ*[4] or (b) by construing the alleged masculine pronominal form *yó* as standing for the neuter pronominal form *yát* towards bringing it into proper concord, as due, with the said neuter pronominal form *tát* in Pāda *a*, governing *bhárgaḥ* in Pāda *b*[5]. But it is passing strange that none in the now almost two-century long range of Western commentators, right from Sir William Jones down to Kieth and Geldner, have made any reference to the problem before us. May be, they thought that it was mere verbal quibbling that the medieval scholiasts had leisurely indulged in. It will soon be obvious, however, that if they thought like that, they failed to take cognizance of a really difficult situation and, hence, missed a good opportunity of probing into an interesting linguistic secret.

IV

The scholiastic speculation that the apparently accusative pronoun *tát* in Pāda *a* should be construed as the genitive pronoun *tásya* cannot be accepted, because it spoils the poetic charm and directness of appeal. The poet, no doubt, glorifies in this verse the god Savitár, but he achieves this object, indirectly, by glorifying the refulgent (*várenyam*)[6] brilliance (*bhárgas*) of that god. His reason for this indirect glorification is clear, namely, that it is the bright light radiating from the god that really awakens the emotional fervour in his heart which naturally leaps up in praise of the immediate source of its inspiration, that is, the said light. The lyrical urge and romantic exhilaration, being the essence of poetry, welling up within him at the sight, in front of him, of this light, spontaneously up-raises itself, so to say, towards reaching its highest tide-peak by carrying and keeping itself nearest to its source. From the poetic point of view, this emotional phenomenon is characterised by the most direct approach by an aroused and enkindled heart to the obvious centre of appeal, which, in the present context, is the light of Savitár. At the moment, the relationship that subsists between Savitár and his light has a merely accidental value. Therefore, the content of *c* which offers the most significant justification to the content of *a b* can have a direct reference to *bhárgas* 'light' alone and not to the god Savitár to whom that *bhárgas* 'light,' no doubt, belongs.[7]

3. Compare AB. IV, 32, 2 etc. (see Bloomfield: *Vedic Concordance*, p. 392 for all other Brāhmaṇic references), where this verse is prescribed for recital either to the accompaniment of particular Vedic rituals or as a most sacred formula of great mystic import. This high status of it had already become established in YV. *Saṁhitās*, white as well as black. Although it does not occur as such in either of the AV. *Saṁhitās*, it seems probable that *Anukramaṇī* has correctly postulated the dedication of AV. XIX, 71, 1 (*stutā mayā varadā vedamātā* etc.) to it, being treated as a separate diety, namely, Veda-mātár- GB. (1, 38), indeed, speaks of it as such (*vedānāṁ mataraṁ sāvitrīm* etc.). The methodology of Brāhmaṇic exposition, as is well known, concerned itself only with indicating the elements of particular rituals, supplying, incidently, a mere mythological or allegorical annotation of the texts recited on the occasion and did not attempt anything like a running commentary from the literal and grammatical viewpoint. No wonder, then, that nowhere in these numerous texts has any notice been taken of our present problem.

4. Compare Sāyaṇa on RV. III, 62, 10; VSK. III, 43; SV. II, 812, Bhatta Bhāskara on TS. I, 5, 6, 4, Uvata and Mahīdhara on VS. III, 35.

5. Compare Sāyaṇa on RV. and Mahīdhara on VS. *supra cit.*

6. Palaeo-etymologically, √*bhrasj*, √*bhṛj*, √*bhrāj*, √*bhlas*, √*bhās*, √*vrādh*, √*rāj*, √*bhrej*, √*rej*, √*vradh*, √*arc*, √*ruc*, √*rus*, √*las*, √*laṣ*, *bhárgas-*, *bradhná-*, *raśmí-*, *rúci-*, *arcís*, *vrādhat-*, *vrādhan-tama-*, *vartí-* 'wick' and *várenya-* (in the present context) in OIA., *battī* 'flame', 'light' and *vatt* 'wick' etc. in NIA. and √*burn* and *wick* in English, each essentially denoting 'brightness', might be considered as cognates.

7. If Geldner had not remained content with his aphoristic remark (see his translation Pt. I, p. 410, fn. on v. 10*c*) "er-lautert *a b*" and had but chosen to follow up the full implication of his own said remark, he might have saved himself from the previous commentators' common syntactical error of construing the pronoun *yó* in *c* with *savitúr* in *a* instead of *bhárgaḥ* in *b*.

The god is expected to accept the praise of his light as being his own praise as every owner does when something that he owns is praised or as every parent does when his or her child is praised. Indeed, the consciousness of the presence of the invisible god Savitár behind the apparent dazzling brilliance is an article of faith with the poet which he just acknowledges in *a*. But his uppermost feeling at the moment is that he should proceed forthwith to worship (*dhīmahi*) the said divine brilliance (*bhárgas*),[8] which is compelling in its appeal in that already full of inspiration as it is for him, it can further purify (*pracodáyāt*)[9] his hymns and prayers (*dhíyaḥ*)[10] so much so that their acceptance by not one but all the gods would become well assured.

The said divine brilliance (*bhárgas*), when looked upon under a spell of inspired devotion, enters, so to speak, the heart of the devotee, removing all impurities from his thoughts and desires as the same, in the form of his hymn (*dhí*), reach out to the gods. In consonance with this poetic imagery, *yó* in *c* demands its construction with neuter *bhárgaḥ* in *b* being held valid and, therefore, justified on some new etymo-morphological basis. In consequence, ***tát*** in ***a*** demands, in its turn, that, as an expression of the poet's demonstrably direct approach to the said divine brilliance (*bhárgas*), it must retain its present objective case-relation which need not at

8. Compare, RV. I, 159, 5 (*a b*):

तद् राधो अद्य सवितुर् वरेण्यं, वयं देवस्य प्रसवे मनामहे ।

where another poet, Dīrghatamas, son of Ucatha, in a similar situation of his heart, addresses himself direct to the same dazzling (*váreṇya-*) brilliance (*rā́dhas-*) of the god (*devá-*) Savitár for the same purpose, namely, perfect purification (*prasavá-*). Only apparently self-contained in so far as it goes, this hemistich seems to have been, at one time, the first half of a different verse, addressed, as a whole, to the god Savitár, the second half of which was lost in some way. It should be an interesting pursuit to trace out the said second half of that verse and, also, the original first half, that, too, seems to have been lost, of the present verse, which at first, might have been addressed, as a whole, to the divine couple, Dív- and Pṛthiví-. As *Bṛhad-devatā* and *Anukramaṇī* both dedicate the entire hymn as such to the said twin dieties, probably, the present verse might have read differently, as suggested here, in their day.

9. Compare RV. VI. 47, 10:

इन्द्र मृळ मह्यं जीवातुमिच्छ, चोदय धियमयसो न धाराम् ।
यत् किञ्चाहं त्वायुरिदं वदामि, तज्जुषस्व कृधि मा देववन्तम् ॥

where the poet Bharga prays:

"O Indra ! be pleased and wish me (long) life; (do) cleanse (my) prayer (as they do) a (rusty) metallic edge.

Devoted to thee, whatever I say in this (prayer), do accept that; make me have (my) god (thee) with (me)."

As the removal of dust, at the hands of man himself, from a metallic edge is the prime means of making the latter sharp enough for his use, so the removal of impurities, at the hands of one's god himself, from one's prayer is indicated here as being the prime means of making the latter pure enough for the god's acceptance. Full of faith in the grace of his god in this matter, the poet musters up enough of courage to pray to his god to be pleased to accept whatever he had to offer him by way of prayer and, as a token thereof, to make him feel that he stood-by his side. The simile points to the process of purification and not of sharpening, driving or stimulating, as understood by others, being the only appropriate meaning of √*cud*>*codi*, in the present context. As the satisfaction of the poet hangs on the sweet will of the god to accept or reject his prayer, there cannot be any point in seeking to get the edge of his prayer sharpened, for, then, it will have an irresistible drive of itself, not permitting the god to have any other choice except acceptance.

Palaeo-etymologically, OIA. √*cud*>*codi* might cognate with OIA. √*s'udh* >*s'odhi*, √*sādh* (as in *prasādhana-* 'decoration' and, in particular, when in similar relationship with *dhí-* 'prayer' in RV. etc,) and, √*kṣāli*; NIA. √*sodhanā* 'clarify', *caundha-* 'dazzling' (Compare, also, OIA. *camat-* 'light' [not 'surprise' as ordinarily rendered] to which, as **camad-*, [and not to √*cand* 'gratify,' as generally done] OIA. *candrá-* [<**camadra-* 'moon' should preferably be traced, *cāmīkará-* [<**cāmat-kara-*]' gold' and NIA. *cāndī-* [<**cāmad- vatī-*] 'silver,' √*chatanā* 'wash' [clothes], √*kūtanā*, ibid.)

10. The poet Vis'vāmitra, son of Gāthin, has addressed the present hymn (RV. III,62) to a number of other dieties besides Savitár. Thus, the verse 7 ushers in a recital (*s'asyate*) of fresh worship (*suṣṭutir*) to Pūṣán and the next verse 8 prays to the god to accept this worship, equating the same with *gír-*, and *dhí-*. Obviously, in a context like this, *dhí-* connotes 'a prayer' or 'a hymn of praise', being the subject of recitation (√*s'as*). In the verse 12, too, priests (*víprāḥ*), enthused (*iṣitā́ḥ*) by (their) hymn (*dhí-*), worship (*namasyánti*) the god, Savitár with well-dressed (*suvṛktíbhiḥ*) offerings (*yajñaiḥ*). For the fixation of this meaning of *dhí-* in its construction, like this, with √*iṣ*, a comparison might be made with RV.I, 3,5 ; III, 12,1 ; 60, 5. That *dhí-* as read in these texts possesses the suggested connotation is further supported by RV.IV,49,10 ; VII,33,13 and IX,37, 6 where, in identical relationship, the word *kaví-* (denoting 'hymn' instead of 'hymn-maker') and the word *námas-* 'prayer' replace the word *dhí-*. Coming as our verse 10 does between the verses 8 and 12, it seems quite probable that here, too, the poet has employed the word *dhí-* in the same sense of 'a hymn' and, also, that the verb √*dhā*>*dhī* as used here in *b* denotes 'worship' (Compare, RV.I,3,12 ; 14,2 ; 134,2 ; 143,6 ; II,21,5 ; III, 34,5 ; IV,41 8 ; V,47,6 ; 81,1 ; VI,21,1 ; 35,1 ; 3; VII,10,1 ; 27, 1 ; VIII,26, 25 ; 35,16 ; 40,9 ; 46,11 ; 60,12 ; 63,1; IX 22,3 ; 47,4 ; 79,1 ; 86, 17; X, 39,2 ; 143,3 ; 156, 1 etc. where *dhí-* and RV. V,82,1; VI,19,2 ; VII, 90,3 etc. where √*dhā* have similar connotation. Out of a very large number of texts which could be adduced to support the present thesis, only a few have been given here just to illustrate the point. Indeed, the subject deserves a full and independent treatment in a separate paper).

all be violated to lend it the suggested genitive colour towards its unwanted concord with the next word *Savitúr*.[11]

V

When the medieval commentators proposed taking the accusative pronoun *tát* as standing for the genitive pronoun *tásya*, they evidently took shelter behind the Pāṇinian admission of inter-substitution of case-forms.[12] But it seems unthinkable that any language, much less, the highly developed Vedic language could tolerate this kind of usage which would necessarily mean negation of clear communication of thought between one speaker and another. What might have happened was that a number of word-forms had become identical, mainly, owing to the working, through the ages, of the natural process of phonetic decay. Thus, to take the only example which has been employed by the Pāṇinian school to illustrate the phenomenon of the use of one case-form for another, namely, *pánthāḥ* in RV. X, 85, 23 which, they say, is nominative singular used in place of the nominative plural *pánthānaḥ* of the base *pathín-* 'way'. In order to understand the situation clearly, we have to note that there are, besides this form *pánthāḥ* which is nominative singular as well as plural, the other two closely resembling forms, namely, *pánthām* (acc. sing.) and *pánthāsaḥ* (nom. plu.) which might be considered together. If we postulate here a new base **pánthās-* instead of Pāṇini's *pathín-*, all of these forms can be easily reduced to it.[13] For, the two forms *pánthāḥ* (nom. sing.) and *pánthāsaḥ* (nom. plu.) are quite regular and the other two forms, also, become obviously regular by admitting in their evolution the simple Prākritism of the elision of an inter-vocalic consonant followed by the coalescence of the vowels, which become contiguous as a result of the said elision. This process may be represented as under:

(1) *Pánthāsaḥ*>**pánthāhaḥ*>**pánthāaḥ*>*pánthāḥ* (=nom. plu., hence quite distinct from *pánthāḥ* (nom. sing.)

(2) *Pánthāsam* (=acc. sing.) **pánthāham*>**pánthāam*>*pánthām*.[14]

Therefore, to try to follow up, in terms of the aforesaid phenomenon of phonetic decay, the implication of the medieval scholiasts' suggestion, namely, that *tát* here stands for *tásya*, we might indicate, linguistically, the necessary relevant phonetic postulation as under:—

tásya savitúr>**tássa savitúr*>**tás savitúr*>*tát savitúr*[15]

In other words, we would have to say that Pāda *a* originally read as follows:—

तस्य सवितुर् वरेण्यम्

This reading would apparently have an advantage over the current reading, which is defective by one syllable, in normalising the number of syllables in the verse, but, still, it cannot be accepted. For, metrically, it is evident that *várenyam* must be read here

11. Compare VS.XVII, 74 for a very evident illustration of the necessary full grammatical concord between the pronouns *yád-* and *tád-*.

12. Compare, Pā.III,1,85 enunciating admission of irregularity (*vyatyaya*), in general, in Vedic word-forms, categorically referred to in the following Kārikā:

सुप्तिङुपग्रहलिङ्गनराणां, कालहलच्स्वरकर्तृयङां च ।
व्यत्ययमिच्छति शास्त्रकृदेषां, सोऽपि हि सिद्ध्यति बाहुलकेन ॥

Compare, also, Pā. VII, 1, 39 and, particularly, the Vārttika:

सुपां सुपो भवन्तीति वक्तव्यम्

on the same, pointing to the substitution, in general, of one case form in place of another.

13. In postulating the base as **pánthās-* in preference to **pánthas-*, the idea is to reach the nom. plu. form *pánthāsaḥ* straightway without taking recourse to another postulation, namely, **pántha-* and, then, invoking the aid of Pā. VII, 1,50 which might supply the extended nom. plu. suffix *-asas* in place of *-as* as required to arrive at this form (Compare Vedic word-forms like *uṣā́saḥ, uṣā́sam, sapsarā́saḥ*, respective bases of which, likewise, might advantageously be given a penultimate *ā́* instead of *á* as is being done at present to conform to the Pāṇinian suffixal provision of *-ásuc* in the absence of an additional one for *-ā́suc* as well).

14. That the Pāṇinian technique was primarily evolved to comprehend post-Vedic and not Vedic OIA. is evidently suggested by its having missed, in the present context, to take any notice of the forms *pánthāḥ* (nom. plu.), *pánthāsaḥ* (ibid.) and *pánthām* (acc. sing.) which cannot be, in any way, fitted into its present provisions. Obviously, in order to achieve this end, the provision, in Pā. VII, 1, 85, for converting the base *pathín-* into **pathā́-*, being the first stage on its way to its real destination, **pánthā-*(nom. sing.) must be so extended as to make it applicable to the Vedic forms *pánthāḥ* (nom. plu.) and *pánthām* (acc. sing.). Grammatically, it would have been far more correct for Kātyāyana to admit this supplementary provision than generalising, as he has done, without the least linguistic justification, that in Vedic OIA. one declensional form could be replaced by another without changing the sense (Compare Sāyaṇa who, alone of the medieval scholiasts did, at least once, namely, when commenting on *pánthām* in RV. I,24,8, bethought himself of the aforesaid suggestion of extending the scope of Pā. VII, 1, 85 to the said accusative case-form. It is, however, a pity that instead of marking it off as a fit case demanding justifiable supplementation of the traditional Pāṇinian data, he simply disposed it of as a *vyatyaya* 'irregularity').

15. For the dissimilating conversion of *s* of **tás* into final *t* of *tát* before *s* of *savitúr*, compare the parallel case of **ácakās-si*> **ácakās-s*> **ácakats*>**ácakath*> *ácakat* (II p. sing. of √*cakās*) as implied in Pā. VIII, 2, 74.

iambically, viz. as *várenịam,* so that it might conform to its Vedic measure which, for all practical purposes, has been found to be uniform.[16] This means that, originally, the verse could not at all have begun with the word *tásya* which must inevitably make an unwanted and unexpected addition of an extra syllable to it.

VI

Sāyaṇa offered an alternative solution to our present grammatical problem by proposing that the pronominal form *yó,* which he took, unquestioningly, as the masculine nom. sing. of the pronominal base *yád-*, might be made, apparently, under the authority of the aforesaid general admission, at the hands of the Pāṇinian tradition, that the Vedic language could tolerate every kind of grammatical irregularity, to do duty here for the regular neuter nom. sing. *yát* so that it could concord with the neuter nominal base *bhárgas-* in Pāda *b* and get into correlation with the neuter pronominal form *tát* in Pāda *a* all right. Mahīdhara, too, while commenting on this ṛk at VS. III, 35, expressed his readiness to adopt this suggestion as a sound alternative course. But, linguistically, this is an unsound proposition because the Vedic idiom does not at all countenance the false concord of this type between nominal and pronominal forms of different genders. Indeed, adjectives and pronouns do not have any independent genders of their own; they simply assume the respective genders of the nouns they qualify or are connected with. Thus, one cannot grammatically conceive of expressions like *mahān vanam, mahān nadī, mahatī nadaḥ, mahatī vanam, sa vanam, tad nadaḥ* etc. Therefore, when the Pāṇinian tradition under reference above alludes to the Vedic gender-variation, it has in view, at that time, the same as observed in the case of nouns only. Thus, to take its stock example of the present context, namely, Vedic *mádhoḥ* (besides *mádhunaḥ*) for classical *madhunaḥ*[17] only, it just indicates that during the Vedic period of the history of OIA., the neuter[17] noun *mádhu-* 'honey' or 'sweet drink' possessed oblique declensional forms which fell under three distinct patterns, later on, in course of time, severally distinguished gender-wise and fixed as such.[18]

16. The word *várèṇya-* is read forty (40) times in RV. (at 1, 9, 5; 26, 2; 3; 7; 58, 6; 60, 4; 79, 8; 159, 5; 175, 2; II, 7, 6; III, 2, 4; 12, 1; 27, 9; 10; 34, 8; 40, 5; 62, 6: 10; V, 8, 1 · 13, 4 · 22, 3; 35, 3; 39, 2 81, 2; VI, 16, 33; VIII, 1, 19; 15, 7: 27, 1; 12; 43, 12; 46, 8; 61, 15; 102, 18; IX, 61, 1; 65, 29: X, 35, 7; 91, 1; 113, 2 · 122, 5), six (6) times in AV. (at VI, 23, 1; VII, 15, 4; 55, 6 · 77, 6; XIX, 15, 3; XX, 6, 5) and twice (2) in VS. (at XI, 70; XII, 3), altogether crediting the three texts with the forty-eight (48) occurrences. Out of the forty occurrences in RV., eighteen (18) are found in Gāyatrī verses, three (3) in Triṣṭubh verses, eight (8) in Jagatī verses and the remaining eleven (11 in Anuṣṭubh and a few other measures, being developed variations of the aforesaid basic Vedic metres. Out of the two VS. verses, one is a Gāyatrī and the other a Jagatī. Out of the six AV. verses, one is a Gāyatrī, two are Jagatīs, two Anuṣṭubhs and one is a Pathyā-paṅkti. Out of the forty-eight (48) aforesaid verses, two read it initially, three medially and the remaining forty-three (43) terminally. Except at the single place of its occurrence, namely, RV. I, 58, 6, where it constitutes the end of a Triṣṭubh verse and has to be read as its stands indicated in the current text, that is, as a tri-syllabic word, at all the remaining forty-seven (47) places of its occurrence, whether initial, medial or final, it has to be restored to its obviously original quadri-syllabic iambic structure, viz. **várenịam* or, mannerstically, as *vareniyam* as the ancient authorities, for instance, *RV. Prāti.* XVII, 22-23: *RV. Anukramaṇī*, 1, 2, 6 · *Piṅgala-sūtra* II, 3; *Nidāna-sūtra*, 1, 7, 25-28, *Upanidāna-sūtra*, II, 9-13 etc. would have it.

Whether the text, RV. I, 58, 6, where alone this word has to be read as tri-syllabic, should be allocated, on the basis of the above study, to a time that might have been posterior to the period of composition of the remaining forty-seven (47) verses with the quadri-syllabic reading, or, whether the situation might preferably be satisfied by admitting, on the basis of palaeo-morphology, two concurrently parallel bases, namely, (1) the tri-syllabic *várenyam* and (2) the quadri-syllabic *várenịam* are questions which, it seems, can easily be left over for discussion on some other occasion.

17. See RV.I,14,10 etc. for fixing the Vedic gender of *mádhu*

18. Thus, besides the classically expected neuter forms, *mádhu, mádhunaḥ, mádhunā, mádhune, mádhūnām* and *mádhūni*, there are found in RV. the following forms also :—

(*a*) *mádhoḥ* (I,14,8 etc.) and *mádhau* (VII,32,2 etc.) conforming to the post-Vedic masculine pattern of gen. sing. and loc. sing., respectively.

(*b*) *mádhvaḥ* (I,14,4 etc.) and *mádhvā* (I,47,4 etc.) conforming to the post-Vedic feminine pattern of acc. plu. and inst. sing., respectively.

Palæo-etymologically, however, the above apparently unexpected forms might be said to have developed, through phonetic decay, from their respective parent forms (1) **mádhavanas* (>**mádhavaaḥ*>**mádhavaḥ*>*mádhvaḥ* and **mádhoḥ*, (2) **mádhavani* (>*mádhavan*>**mádhava*>**mádhav*>*mádhau*), (3) **mádhavanas* (>**mádhavaaḥ*>**mádhavaḥ*>*mádhvaḥ*) and (4) **mádhavanā* (>**mádhavaā*>**mádhavā*>*mádhvā*) of the *ur*-base **mádhavan-* (Compare IE. cognates, GK. *méthu*. besides *méthv-* and Eng. *mead*, and *honey* etc.) of which the base *mádhu-* (or, preferably, *mádhun-*) might be considered a somewhat defective descendant. On this basis, the alternative Vedic forms *mádhoḥ, mádhvaḥ, mádhvā* and *mádhau* might be described as being neuter in their own right, which are preserved as such but already more or less as fossils by the Vedic OIA. and discarded as such by the later OIA. from the domain of the masculine and neutre *u*-declension of which the forms like *mádhvaḥ* (acc. plu. and gen. sing.) and *mádhvā* (inst. sing.) dropped off altogether.

VII

In [illegible] view of the above discussion, the pronominal form *yó* in our Gāyatrī text, if it were masculine as it has been universally taken to be so far, could fit in, syntactically, only if the noun, referred to by it, namely, *bhárgas-* in Pāda *b* could be taken as masculine. And, it is certainly amusing to find that a few medieval commentators have actually made a mess of the whole thing by taking *bhárgaḥ* in Pāda *b* as a declensional form of the masculine base, *bhárga-*. Thus, Halāyudha, in his gloss on Gāyatrī in his *Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva*,[19] following an older writer, Yogi-yājñavalkya, whom he quotes *in extenso*,[20] introduces the pronoun *tam* (acc. sing.)

19. तं (?) तस्य भर्गं (?) तेजो धीमहि चिन्तयामः । अत्र यद्यपि तमिति पदं भर्गविशेषणं तथापि 'यः' इति यच्छब्दप्रयोगादेत्र तच्छब्दो लभ्यते । तथा योगियाज्ञवल्क्यः

"तच्छब्देन तु यच्छब्दो बोद्धव्यः सततं बुधैः ।
उदाहृते तु यच्छब्दे तच्छब्दः स्यादुदाहृतः ॥"

किंविशिष्टं भर्गम् ? यो भर्गो नोऽस्माकं धियो बुद्धीः प्रचोदयात् प्रेरयेत् तथा च योगि-याज्ञवल्क्यः ।

"चिन्तयामो वयं भर्गं धियो यो नः प्रचोदयात् ।
धर्मार्थकाममोक्षेषु बुद्धिवृत्तिः पुनः पुनः ॥"

इह भर्गशब्देन बहुविधमाहात्म्ययुक्तः सवितृमण्डलगतादित्यदेवतास्वरूपः पुरुष उच्यते । तथा च योगि-याज्ञवल्क्यः ।

"भृजिः पाके भवेद्धातुर्यस्मात्पाचयते ह्यसौ ।
भ्राजते दीप्यते यस्माज्जगच्चान्ते हरत्यपि ॥
कालाग्निरूपमास्थाय सप्तार्चिः सप्तरश्मिभिः ।
भ्राजते यत्स्वरूपेण तस्माद्भर्गः स उच्यते ॥"
तथा—"भे"ति भासयते लोकान् "रे"ति रञ्जयते प्रजाः ।
"ग" इत्यागच्छत्यजस्रं, भरणाद् भर्ग उच्यते ॥"

अतो यद्यपि सवितुर्भर्ग इति सवितृभर्गयोर्भिन्नता गायत्रीमन्त्रे प्रतीयते, तथापि परमार्थचिन्तादशायामादित्यभर्गयोर्भेदो न विद्यते । एवं य एवादित्यः स एव भर्ग इति, य एव भर्गः स एवादित्य इति भर्गादित्ययोरद्वैतमिति स्थितम् ॥

20. The passages cited are not found in the said author's work, called *Yajñavalkya-saṁhitā* (Cal. 1887) or *Yogi-yājñavalkyam* (Trivandrum, 1938) which deals with the eight aṅgas of Yoga but does not say anything about the Gāyatrī. There is, however, another work, presumably, by a different author of the same name, of which a few manuscripts are preserved in the Deccan College Collection (See Kane : *History of Dharma-s'astra*, Vol. I, p. 190), the Vishveshvaranand Institute Collection and

to concord with (*bhárga->*) *bhárgaḥ* (nom. sing.=acc. sing. by implication) towards correlating the same with *yó* (=*yáḥ* [*bhárga->*] *bhárgaḥ*). S'atrughna, in his *Mantrārtha-dīpikā*, for which he claims no originality,[21] has practically copied out Halāyudha's comment in its entirety. These writers dispose of *tát* by taking it for the genitive *tásya* towards its construction with *Savitúr*. Guṇaviṣṇu, the author of *Chāndogya-mantra-bhāṣya-*,[22] was bold enough to state that *tát* referred, by implication, to the course of study (*adhyayana-*) and that *váreṇya-* ('to be desired') and *bhárga-* ('to be pursued' should rather be, 'to be cooked'), both were adjectives qualifying *tát* after the manner of potential participles, and, further, that the genitive in *Savitúḥ* and *devásya* was used in the sense of 'agent'. He took the form *bhárgaḥ* to be nom. sing. of the masculine base *bhárga-* but, undeterred by that observation of his own, he thought that it was only a Vedic irregular use for acc. sing. **bhárgam* which, he imagined, he wanted here. Even the semblance of consistency, however, forsook him when on reaching Pāda *c*, he simply followed the previous commentators in construing *yó* with *Savitár* instead of *adhyayana-*, being his meaning of *tát*, which one would have expected from him here[23]. Probably, he got unnerved when the real crux of the whole matter, namely, the correct construction of *yó*, suddenly stared him in the face after he had exhausted, it seems, his whole ingenuity in interpreting Pādas *a* and *b* as a self-contained unit, unconnected with Pāda *c*.

VIII

The solution proper, from the strict syntactical consideration, if to be expressed under the familiar Pāṇinian terminology, would

some other collection (See Aufrecht. *Catalogus Catalogorum*, p. 478, under *yoga* (*gi*)-*yājñavalkya*. Halāyudha's citations regarding the Gāyatrī have been taken from the Chapter 8 of this work which is variously entitled as *Yogi-yājñavalkya*, *Yogi-yājñavalkya-dharmas'āstra*, *Bṛhad-yogi-yājñavalkya* and *Bṛhad-yogi-yājñavalkya-smṛti*.

21. Banaras, 1948 V. see pp. 2 and 3 (verses 9 and 10) and pp. 22 and 23.

22. Ed. Durgamohan Bhattacharya, Cal., 1930, pp. 74-75.

23. His comment may as well be supplied here in his own words:

'तत्' अध्ययनं भगवतः 'सवितुः' 'देवस्य' 'वरेण्यं' वरणीयं 'भर्गः' भजनीयं (? = भर्जनीयं) सवित्रापि सेव्यं (?) 'धीमहि' चिन्तयामः । स किम्भूतः सविता ? 'यः' 'नः' अस्माकं 'धियः'...'भर्गः' इति 'भृजि'-धातोः कर्मणि (= कृत्यार्थे) घञ्, व्यत्ययेन पुंस्त्वप्रथमैकवचने ।

lie in construing *yó* in Pāda *c* as neut. nom. sing. of either of the pronominal bases **yás-*, and **yávan-*, both being postulated as variants of the pronominal base *yád-*[24] which alone is accepted, at present, by the students of OIA.[25] It is, also, possible that the current reading *yó naḥ*, in our text, might be representing the original reading **yád naḥ*, >**yánnaḥ*, Prākritically changed to **yā̆naḥ* which was wrongly re-Sanskritised into the current reading *yó naḥ*, presumably, under the erroneous impression, which has yet to die out, that the pronoun here stood for the masculine base *Savitár-* and not, in correlation with the pronoun *tát* in Pāda *a*, for the neuter base *bhárgas-* in Pāda *b* as has already been discussed above in

24. Palaeo-etymologically, these bases, namely, *yád(*s)-* and **yávan-* might be described as collateral phonetic remnants of the *ur*-base **(bh)yámasmad(s)-*, being the common basic ancestor of the OIA. forms *yáḥ, yaú, yé; yā, yé, yāḥ; yát* and *yā̆ni* etc., on the one hand, and *yásmai, yásmāt* and *yásmin*, on the other (Contrast here the Pāṇinian conception [Pa. VII, 1, 15-16] of the entire word-portions *-smai* *-smāt* and *-smin* as suffixal and not basic elements), the NIA. forms *jo, jaun, jis, jise, jin, jas* etc. and, at the IE. level, the Eng. forms *which, who, that* etc. Accordingly, in the former case, *yó* in our Pāda *c* will represent **yás->yáḥ* (*neu. nom. sing.) >*yó* (before *naḥ*, under the accepted sandhi rules, Pā. VI, 1, 113; VIII, 2, 66), but, in the latter case, it will stand for **yávan>*yav* (neu. nom. sing. like *kárman->kárma* etc.) >*yó* (before *naḥ*, under the process of *ablaut* of *av : o*). *Inter alia*, the latter OIA. postulate **yávan-* will be readily observed as having been phonetically transformed into the NIA. base *jaun* (Contrast here the view put forth by Bloch [*Siddha-Bhāratī*, Pt. 1. pp. 68-70] that the NIA bases, *jaun-* and *taun-* have been modelled, analogically, after the NIA. base *kaun-* which he traces to the supposed combination of (OIA. *kim->*) *káḥ* and (*ātmán->*) MIA. and NIA. *appan-*, rejecting Beams' as well as his own previous derivation of *kaun-* from the OIA. combination *kaḥ punaḥ*)

25. It is interesting to find after having made a critical study of over one hundred Vedic verses, in which the correlative pronouns *yád-* and *tád-* are read, that if this study is exhaustively instituted, it is likely to prove an effective means of bringing to light a number of, so to say, such fossilised declensional forms of the said two pronouns as might justify the postulation of the parallel pronominal bases, **yā̆d-, *yás-, *yās-, *yáman-, *yávan-*, and **yód-*, etc. along-side of *yád-* and, *mutatis mutandis*, of **tā̆d-, *tás-, *sás-, *sās, *táman-, *távan-, *sávan-* and *sód-* etc. along-side of *tád-*. Compare, meanwhile, RV. I. 84,9 and I,155,4 where the adv. (=neu. acc. sing.) *yáḥ* (<*yás-*) is used for *yát* (<*yád-*) and RV.I, 116, 6; 144,4; 148,1; 3; 151,1 and VI, 34,3 where the adv. (=neu. acc. sing.) *yám* (<**yám-*) is similarly used for *yát* (<*yā̆d-*). Also, compare, for a parallel study, RV. I, 144, 5 and IV, 32, 13 where the adv. (=neu. acc. sing.) *tám* (<**tám-*) is used for *tát* (<*tā̆d-*) and RV. VIII, 13,19 where either *yát*, in the first hemistich, has to be construed as standing for the masc. nom. sing. *yáḥ* (<*yád-*) or *só* in the second hemistich, has to be taken not as mas. nom. sing. but as adv. (=neu. acc. sing. of **sávan-* or **sáv-*, being equivalent of OIA. (*tád->*) *tát(d)*, NIA. *to* and *so* and Eng. *so*, and, likewise, RV. VIII, 45, 33 where *tāḥ* in Pāda *a*, being correlated with adv. (=neu. acc. sing.) *yád* in

detail. Obviously, this latter suggestion, pertaining as it does to the historical linguistics of Sanskrit, would lie outside the domain proper of Sanskrit grammar as represented by the Pāṇinian terminology which, practically, still holds the field[26].

Pāda *c*, has also to be construed as such and, therefore, represents either 1. (**tā̆s->*) *tā̆ḥ* (=[**tā̆d->*] *tā̆t* [cf. RV. VI, 21,6 where it is similarly used as adv. (=neu. acc. sing.) in correlation with **yā̆d->yā̆t*]) or 2. (**tás->*) **tás* (*sukīrtáyaḥ*)>**tā̆ su°* (through Prākritic elision of one *s* accompanied by the balancing elongation of the previous *á*)>*tā̆ḥ* (through incorrect Sanskritisation, adding *ḥ* to **tā̆* under the impression that the pronominal form was to be in apposition with the following fem. nom. plu. *sukīrtáyaḥ*).

26 Compare, however, the adjectival and adverbial base *yā̆vat-* (along-side of the correlated base *tā̆vat-*) in which **yā̆-* is equivalent to *yád-* (along-side of **tā̆-* [*in tā̆vat-*] which is equivalent to *tád-*) and, also, the remarks, already made, in the footnote 25, in regard to the possible Prākritism of *tás> *tā̆* (before its re-Sanskritisation into *tā̆ḥ*) in RV. VIII,45,33.